they charge for calls made from outside prison. For example, one organization found that a 15-minute collect call made from San Quentin Prison to Oakland, both in California, would cost $5; whereas, the same collect call made from outside the prison would be about $2.55. That's for a collect call. It would be even cheaper if a reliable way were established for inmates to pay for their own calls.

S. 1749 requires the GAO to study the issue of exorbitant prison telephone rates and the gulf between those rates as the first step to finally bringing those rates down to reasonable levels so that inmates and their families have a much easier time staying in touch. In addition, the study will look at State and Federal efforts to prevent smuggling of cell phones into prisons and jails.

Although we should not allow prisoners to have access to cell phones while incarcerated, it is appropriate to provide them with telephone service at reasonable rates in order for them to maintain ties with their families and children.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The use of illegal cell phones by prisoners is on the rise. In California, for example, news stories report that the number of cell phones confiscated in prisons doubled from 2007 to 2008. In 2008, over 2,800 cell phones were found in California, but more than 2,800 were found just in the first 6 months of 2009. The Alabama Department of Corrections found more than 3,000 cell phones in 2009. In fact, there were more cell phones than any other type of contraband found in all of Alabama prisons.

Other State prison systems are experiencing the same increase in the number of contraband cell phones. As a result, many States are considering legislation that specifically prohibits prisoners from possessing cell phones in State prisons.

S. 1749 takes a step in the same direction at the Federal level. S. 1749, the Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010, does two things. First, the bill makes it a crime for Federal prisoners to possess cell phones. Second, the bill directs the GAO to study the cost and use of landlines and smuggled cell phones in Federal and selected State prisons and jails.

This legislation is timely. Inmates use smuggled cell phones to coordinate drug deals on the outside, also, gang violence and other crimes, all committed outside the prison by use of smuggled cell phones to coordinate this activity that are used in the prison system.

Last year, an inmate in Maryland was accused of using a cell phone to arrange a murder of a witness who had testified against him at a trial. And in 2008, a condemned murderer on death row in my home State of Texas used a smuggled cell phone to threaten a State senator. That State senator happened to be the chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee in the State senate. Since that time, at least nine death row inmates in Texas were found to be in possession of contraband cell phones.

I don't personally think that inmates should have such open access to cell phones at all in State prisons.

To get more data on this issue, S. 1749 directs the General Accountability Office, or the GAO, to study the costs and revenues associated with the operation of landline telephones in the prison system. The study will examine select State and Federal efforts to prevent the smuggling of cell phones and other wireless devices into prisons, including efforts made to minimize trafficking of cell phones by prison guards, who are the number one source of getting cell phones in the penitentiary, and also other officials.

News stories report that prison guards are a major means in which cell phones are smuggled into prison, and prisoners pay anywhere from $300 for a normal cell phone and up to $1,000 for the smartphone. A prison guard in California made $100,000 just dealing in cell phones in the penitentiary.

It's my hope and expectation that the GAO study will help Congress and the States in the effort to combat the smuggling of cell phones into penitentiaries.

I support S. 1749. I'm also a cosponsor of another piece of legislation dealing with this specific issue, H.R. 560, the Safe Prisons Communications Act of 2009. This was introduced by my colleague from the Woodlands, Texas, area, KEVIN BRADY. This bill would allow the State or the Federal Bureau of Prisons to petition the FCC to permit them to use devices that jam cell phone signals within the prison boundary. Prisoners would then have no use for a smuggled cell phone as they would not work within the prison confinement. Along with making cell phone possession a crime, I believe Congress should also look at Mr. BRADY's bill, H.R. 560, as a way to prevent the use of cell phones in the penitentiary.

I urge all Members to support S. 1749.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no one disagrees prisoners shouldn't have cell phones. Prisons ban them already. But some prisoners have a habit of getting around the rules—even if it's a federal crime. And it's a dangerous problem. In Texas, we've had cases where prisoners on death row made threatening calls to victims, prosecutors and their families.

Senator FEINSTEIN's bill takes a baby step—but little more. We need to give our prison officials a more reliable weapon. The answer is allowing them to use devices that jam the cell signals—making it impossible for the phones to even work.

We have the technology to do this and do it in a way that doesn't interfere with legitimate use—such as for communities that live nearby.

I've introduced legislation, H.R. 560, the Safe Prisons Communications Act, that would create a process whereby a State or prison could petition the FCC to allow them to use the jamming devices, which are currently prohibited. This bill would save lives, and give our prisons the tools they need to really combat this problem.

I ask my House colleagues to support bringing my legislation to the floor.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Cell Phone Contraband Act.

The illegal use of wireless phones in prisons is a serious problem. Smuggled cell phones are used by prisoners to maintain connections with their criminal enterprises beyond prison walls and even to commit crimes from within prison.

A recent Washington Post article reported the following incidents:

A drug dealer behind bars in Maryland used a phone to arrange to have a witness assassinated outside his home last summer.

In Kansas, a convicted killer sneaked out of prison after planning the 2006 escape using a cell phone smuggled by an accomplice. The following year, two inmates escaped another Kansas prison with the help of a former guard and a smuggled cell phone.

California prison officials confiscated about 2,800 cell phones statewide in 2008, double the number discovered the year before.

The Cell Phone Contraband Act makes it a crime for Federal prisoners to possess cell phones while incarcerated. The bill also directs the GAO to study the cost and use of landlines and smuggled cell phones in Federal and selected State prisons and jails. The study will additionally examine selected State and Federal efforts to prevent the smuggling of cell phones and other wireless devices into prisons, including efforts made to minimize trafficking of cell phones by prison guards and other officials.

This is a commonsense bill to ensure that when criminals are locked up, their ability to harm citizens is completely cut off. This legislation will send a strong signal to those that either smuggle or receive contraband cell phones that they will be held accountable.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1749, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2006, 61,200,000 adults (a total of 26.7 percent of the population) contributed a total of 8,100,000,000 hours of volunteer service. Of those who volunteer, 27 percent dedicate their service to education or youth programs, or a total of 16,500,000 adults.

(2) Assuming recent incarceration rates remain unchanged, an estimated 6.6 percent of individuals in the United States will serve time in prison for a crime during their lifetime. The Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation maintains fingerprints and criminal history records on more than 65,000,000 individuals, many of whom have been arrested or convicted multiple times.

(3) A study released in 2002, found that, of individuals released from prison in 15 States in 1994, an estimated 67.5 percent were rearrested for a felony or serious misdemeanor within 3 years. Three-quarters of those new arrests resulted in convictions or a new prison sentence.

(4) Given the large number of individuals with criminal history records and the vulnerability of the population they work with, human service organizations that work with children need an effective and reliable means of obtaining relevant information about criminal histories in order to determine the suitability of a potential volunteer or employee.

(5) The large majority of Americans (88 percent) favor granting youth-serving organizations access to conviction records for screening volunteers and 59 percent favored allowing youth-serving organizations to consider arrest records when screening volunteers. This was the only use for which a majority of those surveyed favored granting access to arrest records.

(6) Congress has previously attempted to ensure that States make Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history background checks available to organizations seeking to screen employees and volunteers who work with children, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities, through the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) and the Volunteers for Children Act (Public Law 105–251; 112 Stat. 1885). However, according to a June 2006 report from the Attorney General, these laws ''did not have the intended impact of broadening the availability of NCPA checks.''. A 2007 survey conducted by MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership found that only 18 States allowed youth mentoring organizations to access nationwide Federal Bureau of Investigation background searches.

(7) Even when accessible, the cost of a criminal history background check can be prohibitively expensive, ranging from $5 to $75 for a State fingerprint check, plus the Federal Bureau of Investigation fee, which ranges from $15.25 to $30.25, depending on the method of processing, for a total of between $21 and $99 for each volunteer or employee.

(8) Delays in processing such checks can also limit their utility. While the Federal Bureau of Investigation processes all civil fingerprint requests in less than 24 hours, State response times vary widely, and can take as long as 42 days.

(9) The Child Safety Pilot Program under section 108 of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) revealed the importance of performing fingerprint-based Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history background checks. Of 68,000 background checks performed through the pilot program as of May 2009, 6 percent of volunteer applicants were found to have a criminal history of concern, including very serious offenses such as sexual abuse of minors, assault, child cruelty, murder, and serious drug offenses.

(10) In an analysis performed on the volunteers screened by the Child Safety Pilot Program, it was found that over 41 percent of the individuals with criminal histories had committed an offense in a State other than the State in which they were applying to volunteer, meaning that a State-only search would not have found relevant criminal results. In addition, even though volunteers knew a background check was being performed, over 50 percent of the individuals found to have a criminal history falsely indicated on their application form that they did not have a criminal history.

(11) The Child Safety Pilot Program also demonstrates that timely and affordable background checks are possible, as background checks under that program are completed within 3 to 5 business days at a cost of $18.

SEC. 3. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 5 as section 6; and

(2) by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR CHILD-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'background check designee' means the entity or organization, if any, designated by or entering an agreement with the Attorney General under subsection (b)(3)(A) to carry out or assist in carrying out the duties described in subsection (c);

''(2) the term 'child' means an individual who is less than 18 years of age;

''(3) the term 'covered entity' means a business or organization, whether public, private, for-profit, nonprofit, or voluntary that provides care, care placement, supervision, treatment, education, training, instruction, or recreation to children, including a business or organization that licenses, certifies, or coordinates individuals or organizations to provide care, care placement, supervision, treatment, education, training, instruction, or recreation to children;

''(4) the term 'covered individual' means an individual—

''(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have unsupervised access to a child served by a covered entity; and

''(B) who—

''(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a covered entity; or

''(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a covered entity;

''(5) the term 'criminal history review designee' means an entity or organization, if any, designated by or entering an agreement with the Attorney General under subsection (b)(3)(B) to carry out or assist in carrying out the criminal history review program;

''(6) the term 'criminal history review program' means the program established under subsection (b)(1)(B);

''(7) the term 'identification document' has the meaning given that term in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code;

''(8) the term 'participating entity' means a covered entity that is—

''(A) located in a State that does not have a qualified State program; and

''(B) approved under subsection (f) to receive nationwide background checks in accordance with subsection (c) and participate in the criminal history review program;

''(9) the term 'qualified State program' means a program of a State authorized agency that the Attorney General determines is meeting the standards identified in subsection (b)(2) to ensure that a wide range of youth-serving organizations have affordable and timely access to nationwide background checks;

''(10) the term 'open arrest' means an arrest relating to which charges may still be brought, taking into consideration the applicable statute of limitations;

''(11) the term 'pending charge' means a criminal charge that has not been resolved through conviction, acquittal, dismissal, plea bargain, or any other means;

''(12) the term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; and

''(13) the term 'State authorized agency' means a division or office of a State designated by that State to report, receive, or disseminate criminal history information.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010, the Attorney General shall—

''(A) establish policies and procedures to carry out the duties described in subsection (c); and

''(B) establish a criminal history review program in accordance with subsection (d).

''(2) ASSESSMENTS.—The Attorney General shall conduct—

''(A) an annual assessment of each State authorized agency to determine whether the agency operates a qualified State program, including a review of whether the State authorized agency—

''(i) has designated a wide range of covered entities as eligible to submit State criminal background check requests and nationwide background check requests to the State authorized agency;

''(ii) charges a covered entity not more than a total of $25 and the fee charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a nationwide background check; and

''(iii) returns requests for State criminal background checks and nationwide background checks to a covered entity not later than 10 business days after the date on which the request was made; and

''(B) in addition to an annual assessment under subparagraph (A), an assessment described in that subparagraph of a State authorized agency if—

''(i) a State authorized agency that does not have a qualified State program requests such an assessment; or

''(ii) the Attorney General receives reports from covered entities indicating that a State authorized agency that has a qualified State program no longer meets the standards described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) DESIGNEES.—The Attorney General may—

''(A) designate one or more Federal government agencies or enter into an agreement with any other entity or organization, or entities or organizations to carry out or assist in carrying out the duties described in subsection (c); and

''(B) designate a Federal government agency or enter into an agreement with 1 or more Federal, State, or local government agencies to carry out or assist in carrying out the criminal history review program.

''(c) ACCESS TO NATIONWIDE BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to streamline the process of obtaining nationwide background checks, provide effective customer service, and facilitate widespread access to nationwide background checks by participating entities.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall—

''(A) handle inquiries from covered entities and inform covered entities about how to request nationwide background checks—

''(i) for a covered entity located in a State with a qualified State program, by referring the covered entity to the State authorized agency; and

''(ii) for a covered entity located in a State without a qualified State program, by providing information on the requirements to become a participating entity;

''(B) provide participating entities with access to nationwide background checks on covered individuals in accordance with this section;

''(C) receive paper and electronic requests for nationwide background checks on covered individuals from participating entities;

''(D) to the extent practicable, negotiate an agreement with each State authorized agency under which—

''(i) that State authorized agency shall conduct a State criminal background check within the time periods specified in subsection (e) in response to a request from the Attorney General or the background check designee and provide criminal history records to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee; and

''(ii) a participating entity may elect to obtain a State criminal background check, in addition to a nationwide background check, through 1 unified request to the Attorney General or the background check designee;

''(E) convert all paper fingerprint cards into an electronic form and securely transmit all fingerprints electronically to the national criminal history background check system and, if appropriate, the State authorized agencies;

''(F) collect a fee to conduct the nationwide background check, and, if appropriate, a State criminal background check, and remit fees to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, if appropriate, the State authorized agencies; and

''(G) coordinate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, participating State authorized agencies, and the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee to ensure that background check requests are being completed within the time periods specified in subsection (e).

''(3) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A request for a nationwide background check by a participating entity shall include—

''(A) the fingerprints of the covered individual, in paper or electronic form;

''(B) a photocopy of a valid identification document; and

''(C) a statement completed and signed by the covered individual that—

''(i) sets out the covered individual's name, address, and date of birth, as those items of information appear on a valid identification document, and demographic characteristics defined at subsection (j)(2)(A);

''(ii) notifies the covered individual that the Attorney General and, if appropriate, a State authorized agency may perform a criminal history background check and that the signature of the covered individual on the statement constitutes an acknowledgment that such a check may be conducted;

''(iii) notifies the covered individual that the signature of the covered individual constitutes consent to participate in the criminal history review program, under which the participating entity may be informed if the criminal history records of the covered individual reveal a criminal history that warrants special concern or further inquiry;

''(iv) notifies the covered individual that the covered individual shall be provided with a copy of the criminal history records of the covered individual and shall have 10 business days to review the records, challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the records, or withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program before any information about the criminal history of the covered individual is provided to the participating entity; and

''(v) notifies the covered individual that prior to and after the completion of the background check, the participating entity may choose to deny the covered individual access to children.

''(4) FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General or the background check designee may collect a fee to defray the costs of carrying out the duties described in this subsection, the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State and local agencies in resolving the accuracy of criminal history records of covered individuals, and the duties of the criminal history review designee under this section—

''(i) for a nationwide background check and criminal history review, in an amount not to exceed the lesser of—

''(I) the sum of—

''(aa) the actual cost to the Attorney General or the background check designee of conducting a nationwide background check; and

''(bb) the actual cost to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee of conducting a criminal history review under this section; or

''(II) to the extent practicable, no greater than $25 for a covered individual who volunteers with a covered entity except that where practicable the fee may be waived by the Attorney General upon a showing of substantial hardship; and

''(ii) for a State criminal background check described in paragraph (2)(D), in the amount specified in the agreement with the applicable State authorized agency, not to exceed $25.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A participating entity may not charge another entity or individual a surcharge to access a background check conducted under this section.

''(ii) VIOLATION.—The Attorney General shall bar any participating entity that the Attorney General determines violated clause (i) from submitting background checks under this section.

''(d) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the criminal history review program is to provide participating entities with reliable and accurate information regarding whether a covered individual has been convicted of, or has an open arrest or pending charges for, a crime that may bear upon the fitness of the covered individual to have responsibility for the safety and well-being of the children in their care.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall—

''(A) establish procedures to securely receive criminal history records from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if necessary, and from State authorized agencies, if appropriate;

''(B) after receiving a criminal history record from the Federal Bureau of Investigation transmit to the covered individual—

''(i) the criminal history records;

''(ii) a detailed notification of the rights of the covered individual under subsection (g); and

''(iii) information about how to contact the Attorney General or criminal history review designee for the purpose of challenging the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record or to withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program;

''(C) if the covered individual informs the Attorney General or criminal history review designee that the covered individual intends to challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record, assist the covered individual in contacting the appropriate persons or offices within the Federal Bureau of Investigation or State authorized agency;

''(D) make determinations regarding whether the criminal history records received in response to a criminal history background check conducted under this section indicate that the covered individual has a criminal history that may bear on the covered individual's fitness to provide care to children, based solely on the criteria described in paragraph (3);

''(E) unless the covered individual has withdrawn consent to participate in the criminal history review program, convey to the participating entity that submitted the request for a nationwide background check—

''(i) which of the 3 categorizations described in paragraph (3) criminal conviction of special concern identified, further inquiry recommended, or no criminal records of special concern identified apply to the covered individual;

''(ii) information and guidance relating to the appropriate use of criminal history information when making decisions regarding hiring employees and using volunteers;

''(iii) if a criminal history that meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) is found, a recommendation to the participating entity to consult with the covered individual in order to obtain more information about the criminal history of the covered individual, and a list of factors to consider in assessing the significance of that criminal history, including—

''(I) the nature, gravity, and circumstances of the offense, including whether the individual was convicted of the offense;

''(II) the period of time that has elapsed since the date of the offense or end of a period of incarceration or supervised release;

''(III) the nature of the position held or sought; and

''(IV) any evidence of rehabilitation; and

''(iv) instructions and guidance that, in evaluating the considerations described in clause (iii), the participating entity should consult the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Policy Statement on the Issue of Conviction Records under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act or any successor thereto issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

''(F) if a covered individual has withdrawn consent to participate in the criminal history review program, inform the participating entity that consent has been withdrawn;

''(G) work with the Attorney General or the background check designee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to develop processes and procedures to ensure that criminal history background check requests are completed within the time periods specified in subsection (e); and

''(H) serve as a national resource center to provide guidance and assistance to participating entities on how to interpret criminal history information, the possible restrictions that apply when making hiring decisions

based on criminal histories, and other related information.

''(3) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—The Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall, in determining when a criminal history record indicates that a covered individual has a criminal history that may bear on the fitness of the covered individual to provide care to children—

''(A) assign a categorization of criminal conviction of special concern identified if a covered individual is found to have a conviction that would prevent the individual from being approved as a foster or adoptive parent under section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A));

''(B) assign a categorization of further inquiry recommended if a covered individual is found to have—

''(i) a conviction for a serious misdemeanor, committed against a child, involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A));

''(ii) a conviction for a serious misdemeanor, not committed against a child, involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)) unless 5 years has elapsed since the later of the date of conviction and the date of release of the person from imprisonment for that conviction;

''(iii) an open arrest or pending charge for a felony described in, or a serious misdemeanor involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in, section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)); and

''(C) assign a categorization of no criminal records of special concern identified for a covered individual that does not meet the criteria described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(e) TIMING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless exceptional circumstances apply, criminal background checks shall be completed according to the time frame under this subsection. The Attorney General or the background check designee shall work with the criminal history review designee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure that the time limits under this subsection are being achieved.

''(2) APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall electronically submit a national background check request to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if appropriate, the participating State authorized agency not later than 2 business days after the date on which a request for a national background check is received by the Attorney General or the background check designee.

''(3) CONDUCT OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if appropriate, a State authorized agency shall provide criminal history records to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee not later than 2 business days after the date on which the Federal Bureau of Investigation or State authorized agency, as the case may be, receives a request for a nationwide background check from the Attorney General or the background check designee.

''(4) PROVISION OF RECORDS TO COVERED INDIVIDUALS AND OPPORTUNITY TO CHALLENGE.—When the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee finds that a covered individual's criminal history records fall with the categorizations described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (d)(3), the Attorney General or criminal history review designee shall provide the covered individual with the criminal history records of the covered individual and a detailed notification of the rights of the covered individual under subsection (g) not later than 1 business day after the date on which the Attorney General or criminal history review designee receives a criminal history record from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if necessary, resolves any potentially incomplete information in accordance with subsection (d)(2)(B). The covered individual shall have 10 business days from the date sent to challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record or to withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program.

''(5) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEWS.—Unless the Federal Bureau of Investigation certifies that further time is required to resolve a challenge brought by a covered individual, the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall convey to the participating entity the information set forth in subparagraph (F) or (G) of subsection (d)(2), as appropriate, 10 business days after providing the covered individuals with the criminal history records of the covered individual and a notification of their rights under subsection (g).

''(f) PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall determine whether an entity is a covered entity and whether that covered entity should be approved as a participating entity, based on—

''(A) whether the entity is located in a State that has a qualified State program; and

''(B) the consultation conducted under paragraph (2).

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In determining how many covered entities to approve as participating entities, the Attorney General or the background check designee shall consult quarterly with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the criminal history review designee to determine the volume of requests for national background checks that can be completed, based on the capacity of the criminal history review program and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the availability of resources, and the demonstrated need for national background checks in order to protect children.

''(3) PREFERENCE FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—In determining whether a covered entity should be approved as a participating entity under paragraph (1), the Attorney General or the background check designee shall give preference to any organization participating in the Child Safety Pilot Program under section 108(a)(3) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) on the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 and to any other nonprofit organizations.

''(g) RIGHT OF COVERED INDIVIDUALS TO CHALLENGE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF RECORDS.—A covered individual who is the subject of a nationwide background check under this section may challenge the accuracy and completeness of the criminal history records in the criminal history report as provided in subsection (d)(2)(D), without submitting a separate set of fingerprints or an additional fee.

''(h) DUTIES OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—

''(1) RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND RECORDS.—Upon request by the Attorney General or background check designee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall conduct a nationwide background check and provide any criminal history records to the Attorney General or criminal history review designee.

''(2) RESOLUTION OF CHALLENGES.—If a covered individual challenges the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record of the covered individual, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the agency that contributed to the record, shall—

''(A) investigate the challenge with relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and State and local governments;

''(B) promptly make a determination regarding the accuracy and completeness of the challenged information; and

''(C) correct any inaccurate or incomplete records.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

''(2) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that in fiscal year 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, the fees collected by the Attorney General or the background check designee should be sufficient to carry out the duties of the Attorney General or the background check designee under this section and to help support the criminal history review program.

''(j) COLLECTION OF DATA AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the program created under subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on the programs and procedures established under this Act.

''(2) COLLECTION OF DATA.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.—In this paragraph, the term 'demographic characteristics' includes information pertaining to race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, and marital status.

''(B) COMPILING.—Beginning within 90 days after the establishment of the program under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall compile data regarding—

''(i) the number and types of participating entities;

''(ii) the fees charged to participating entities under this section;

''(iii) the time interval between nationwide background check submissions and responses under this section;

''(iv) the fiscal impact of this section on State authorized agencies;

''(v) the number and demographic characteristics of covered individuals submitting a statement described in subsection (c)(3)(A)(iii) as part of a request for a nationwide background check;

''(vi) the number and demographic characteristics of covered individuals determined to have a criminal history;

''(vii) the number, type (including the identity of the offense and whether the offense was committed while the covered individual was a juvenile or adult), and frequency of offenses, and length of the period between the date of the offense and the date of the nationwide background check for any covered individuals found to have a criminal history under this section;

''(viii) the procedures available for covered individuals to challenge the accuracy and completeness of criminal history records under this section;

''(ix) the number and results of challenges to the accuracy and completeness of criminal history records under this section;

''(x) the number and types of corrections of erroneous criminal history records based on a challenge under this section; and

''(xi) the number and types of inquiries for assistance on interpreting a criminal history received by the criminal history review program.

''(C) AGGREGATING DATA.—The Attorney General shall—

''(i) aggregate the data collected under this paragraph by State and city; and

''(ii) aggregate the data collected under clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) of subparagraph (B) by race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, and marital status.

''(D) REPORTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report concerning the data compiled and aggregated under this paragraph.

''(ii) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under clause (i) shall contain—

''(I) the data compiled and aggregated under this paragraph, organized in such a way as to provide a comprehensive analysis of the programs and procedures established under this section;

''(II) information regarding and analysis of—

''(aa) the programs and procedures established under this section; and

''(bb) the extent such programs and procedures have helped screen individuals who may pose a risk to children; and

''(III) information regarding and analysis of whether and to what extent the programs and procedures established under this section are having a disparate impact on individuals based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, or marital status.

''(iii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—A report submitted under clause (i) may contain recommendations to Congress on possible legislative improvements to this section.

''(iv) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Upon the request of any member of Congress, the Attorney General shall make available any of the data compiled or aggregated under this paragraph. The Attorney General shall not make available any data that identifies specific individuals.

''(k) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) FAILURE TO CONDUCT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.—No participating entity shall be liable in an action for damages solely for failure to conduct a criminal background check on a covered individual.

''(B) FAILURE TO TAKE ADVERSE ACTION AGAINST COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—No participating entity shall be liable in an action for damages solely for a failure to take action adverse to a covered individual upon receiving any notice of criminal history from the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee under subsection (d)(2)(F).

''(2) RELIANCE.—A participating entity that reasonably relies on criminal history records received in response to a background check under this section shall not be liable in an action for damages based on the inaccuracy or incompleteness of that information.

''(3) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C) the background check designee and the criminal history review designee, including a director, officer, employee, or agent of the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, shall not be liable in an action for damages relating to the performance of the responsibilities and functions of the background check designee and the criminal history review designee under this section.

''(B) INTENTIONAL, RECKLESS, OR OTHER MISCONDUCT.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in an action if the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, or a director, officer, employee, or agent of the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, engaged in intentional misconduct or acted, or failed to act, with actual malice, with reckless disregard to a substantial risk of causing injury without legal justification, or for a purpose unrelated to the performance of responsibilities or functions under this section.

''(C) ORDINARY BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an act or omission relating to an ordinary business activity, such as an activity involving general administration or operations, the use of motor vehicles, or personnel management.

''(4) CIVIL CLAIMS OF DAMAGES.—Nothing in this subsection shall apply in actions for damages based upon title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Fair Credit Report Act.

''(l) PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.—

''(1) PROHIBITION ON UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS.—Except for a covered individual, any entity or individual authorized to receive or transmit fingerprints or criminal history records under this Act—

''(A) shall use the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records only for the purposes specifically set forth in this Act;

''(B) shall allow access to the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records only to those employees of the entity, and only on such terms, as are necessary to fulfill the purposes set forth in this Act;

''(C) shall not disclose the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records, except as specifically authorized under this Act;

''(D) shall keep a written record of each authorized disclosure of the fingerprints, criminal history records, or the information in the criminal history records; and

''(E) shall maintain adequate security measures to ensure the confidentiality of the fingerprints, the criminal history records, and the information in the criminal history records.

''(2) COMPLIANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations to ensure the enforcement of the nondisclosure requirements under paragraph (1) and to provide for appropriate sanctions in the case of violations of the requirements.

''(B) PARTICIPATING ENTITIES AND DESIGNEES.—The participation in any program under this section by an entity or organization that enters into an agreement with the Attorney General to carry out the duties described in subsection (c) or to carry out the criminal history review program shall be conditioned on the person—

''(i) establishing procedures to ensure compliance with, and respond to any violations of, paragraph (1); and

''(ii) maintaining substantial compliance with paragraph (1).

''(3) DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Attorney General, the background check designee, and the criminal history review designee shall destroy any fingerprints, either in paper or electronic form, or criminal history record received for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act after any transaction based on the fingerprints or criminal history record is completed, and shall not maintain the fingerprints, the criminal history records, or the information in the criminal history record in any form. This paragraph shall not apply to the retention of fingerprints by the FBI, upon consent of the covered individual or in accordance with State or Federal procedures, for the purpose of providing fingerprint verification or subsequent hit notification services, or for the retention of criminal history record information which updates the criminal history record.

''(B) REPEAT APPLICANTS.—A covered individual may sign a release permitting the Attorney General or background check designee to retain the fingerprints of the covered individual for a period not to exceed 5 years, for the sole purpose of participating in the criminal history review program on a subsequent occasion.''.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CHILD SAFETY PILOT.

Section 108(a)(3)(A) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''92-month''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The Child Safety Pilot Program under this paragraph shall terminate on the date that the program for national criminal history background checks for child-serving organizations established under the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 is operating and able to enroll any organization using the Child Safety Pilot Program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1469, the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2009, will permanently authorize the National Child Safety Program.

Passed in 2003 as part of the PROTECT Act, the National Child Safety Pilot Program assists organizations in checking criminal records of volunteers before placing them as mentors with children. Every year, millions of Americans generously give their time and energy to volunteer and mentor children across the country. While most of these volunteers and mentors are only interested in being good role models to children, it is important that we are able to identify those who seek to do harm.

The National Child Safety Pilot Program has enabled youth-serving organizations to access the FBI's national fingerprint-based background check system since 2003. By providing access to the more comprehensive data in the FBI's database, rather than just the in-State background check that would otherwise be available, the program has helped to prevent child predators and sex offenders from getting access to children through legitimate mentoring programs.

□ 1920

Notably, 6 percent of checks have come back showing serious criminal records.

In a study of the pilot program, it was found that over 41 percent of the individuals with criminal histories had committed an offense in a State other than the State in which they were applying to be a volunteer. In these cases,

a State-based search would not have provided a complete picture of the person's criminal record.

Over 50 percent of the individuals found to have a criminal history had falsely indicated on their application form that they did not have a criminal history, even when the volunteers knew a background check was going to be performed.

This is a noncontroversial fee-based program that has successfully provided invaluable information to mentoring organizations at no cost to taxpayers. It makes sense to now make the program permanent.

I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his hard work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, children are our greatest resource in this country. As citizens, as legislators, as parents and grandparents, it's our job to keep them safe, to be vigilant about protecting these children from those who wish to do them harm.

The Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 goes a long way toward ensuring that our children are not harmed by those that they are told to trust. Specifically, this bill extends the Child Safety Pilot Program which provides a background check for volunteer organizations that work with children. The bill also creates a mechanism to replace the pilot program with a permanent background check system that will enroll any organization using the Child Safety Pilot Program.

Originally created in 2003 under the PROTECT Act, the Child Safety Pilot Program has been a proven and effective resource for protecting America's children. Of almost 90,000 background checks performed through the pilot program, 6 percent of volunteer applicants were found to have a criminal history of some concern. These included serious offenses such as sexual abuse of minors, assault, child cruelty, drug offenses, and even homicide.

Since inception of the Child Safety Pilot Program, over 42 percent of those with criminal histories had convictions in a State other than the State in which they were applying to volunteer. If the volunteer group had performed a search of only State records, many relevant criminal convictions would not have been identified. Access to the national criminal database is crucial to ensuring thorough background checks.

During a study of over 1,600 applicants, even though volunteers knew that they would be subjected to a background check, 50 percent or more of them lied on their applications about having a criminal history and, in fact, did have a record that contained criterion offenses. Of the applicants with criminal records, 22 percent had a different name reflected on their record than the one used when they had to volunteer.

Through the pilot program, nonprofit organizations that provide youth-focused care may request criminal history background checks from the FBI on applicants for volunteer or employee positions that entail working with children. The bill builds on the pilot program and would allow other child-serving organizations to better screen volunteers or employees.

Volunteer and other child-serving organizations across the country are working hard to provide safe learning and growing environments for our children. That means hiring professional and responsible employees without a criminal history. H.R. 1469 provides a permanent program that will help these groups do just that.

H.R. 1469 is supported by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America; the YMCA; the Salvation Army; Big Brothers, Big Sisters of America; and Volunteers of America, as well as many other important organizations.

Many Members of this body are parents and grandparents first and Members of Congress second, and this legislation is critical to keeping America's children safe from predators and other criminals. If one less child becomes a victim of crime because of this program, then we have succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, with all the sophisticated information we have, if we are able to find out the criminal history of individuals, this act will allow us to do so.

I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) a former prosecutor and the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Child Protection Improvements Act. I first introduced this legislation in 2007 with my colleague MIKE ROGERS of Michigan. The Child Protection Improvements Act would ensure that any mentoring organization or child-serving nonprofit will be able to obtain an affordable, fast, and accurate background check of a potential volunteer.

About 25 years ago, I began as a volunteer with Big Brothers, Big Sisters. Big Brothers paired me with an extraordinary young man named David. I've always said that I've learned as much or more from David as he ever learned from me. The experience also helped me understand the huge amount of trust we put in volunteers at organizations all around the country. In the vast majority of cases, the trust is well placed; but, unfortunately, there are exceptions.

For that reason, in 2003, Congress created the Child Safety Pilot Program to demonstrate the feasibility of allowing youth-serving nonprofits to access FBI background checks. The FBI maintains a database of criminal histories from every State in the Nation searchable by fingerprint. An FBI search is the gold standard background check, as it cannot be evaded by using a fake name and it will find convictions from every State. I believe the gold standard is what we should strive for when it comes to protecting children who are put in potentially a vulnerable situation.

Since 2003, almost 90,000 background checks have been performed through the pilot. In 94 percent of the cases, the background check returns no serious criminal history. However, in 6 percent of the cases, a record of some kind was found, in some cases an extensive record which the applicant attempted to conceal. In 23 percent of those cases, the applicant gave a name other than the one in their criminal history. Applicants were found with convictions for everything from murder to child abuse to sexual assault; and frequently those convictions were from out of State so that only an FBI background check would have found them.

We have demonstrated that background checks for nonprofits working with children can be conducted quickly, affordably, and accurately. Three times since 2003, Congress has acted to extend the pilot so that thousands of community organizations all over the country don't lose access to background checks for their volunteers. It's time to create a permanent system, one that will protect children while ensuring the civil rights and privacy of volunteers.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS, one of the original cosponsors; Chairman SCOTT, the chairman of the subcommittee; my colleague, MIKE ROGERS; and all other Members who have contributed to this effort and urge the Members to vote ''yes.''

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SCOTT and Chairman CONYERS and also the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for sponsoring this legislation and also want to thank Mr. SCHIFF for not just this piece of legislation but other pieces of legislation in his relentless effort as a Member of Congress to make sure that the greatest resource in our country, children, are protected from child predators.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to, again, thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1469, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FEDS SUING ARIZONA FOR DOING A JOB THE FEDS WON'T DO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department is suing Arizona for enforcing Federal laws that are already on the books. Other States and counties already have enforcement laws like Arizona's.

Prince William County in Virginia has laws almost identical to the new Arizona Senate Bill 1070 enforcement law. Police are allowed to check legal status at any time. Police are also required to check immigration status if anyone is arrested for anything, including DUI or public drunkenness.

According to Corey Stewart, the county board chairman, there has been a 37 percent drop in violent crime in the first 2 years of enforcement of this law. Overall, crime in Prince William County, Virginia, is at a 15-year low. Criminal aliens have fled that part of Virginia and gone somewhere elsewhere the laws are not enforced. Stewart says there has not been one substantiated claim of racial profiling.

Also, the State of Rhode Island enforces Federal immigration law by executive order, like the sanctuary cities, only in reverse. The Governor said his law enforcement officers must enforce this Federal law.

There are more States that follow suit. In Missouri, if police want to see your ID papers to prove legal status, they are free to ask. Sanctuary cities are illegal in Missouri and they enforce the E-Verify system for employers. That's the free system set up by the Federal Government where all employers can check someone's immigration status. In Missouri, you have to be legal to get a driver's license and there is no in-State tuition for illegals at State junior colleges.

So why the double standard at the Justice Department and suing Arizona? Why are the Feds picking on Arizona and not these other States?

On the other hand, there are two laws that expressly forbid States from having sanctuary cities. The laws are found in title 8, section 1373 and title 8, section 1644 of the United States code.

These statutes say cities may not have policy that prohibits peace officers from communicating with the Federal Government about a person's immigration status. But there are cities across the country with policies banning their police from calling the Federal Government to report even criminal illegals.

In San Francisco, one recent case turned tragic. In 2008, there were three members of a family that were gunned down by Salvadoran illegals. Edwin Ramos is a member of the MS–13 narcoterrorist gang, and he is on trial for gunning down one of the members of this family. Two young sons of that family were also gunned down, Matthew and Michael were their names.

They were all in a car driving home from a family barbecue after church. They were not gang members, they were just citizens. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time, and Ramos, their accused killer, had been previously arrested three times.

San Francisco police knew he was an illegal alien MS–13 gang member. The San Francisco Chronicle reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason authorities never called the Federal Government. I repeat. The newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason the authorities did not call the Feds.

Instead of being detained and deported, gang member Edwin Ramos was released, and he killed a father and the two young brothers because of the Federal Government's tolerance to sanctuary cities. So the blood is on the hands of those who support the concept of sanctuary cities. There was even an eyewitness to the shooting, and Tony's youngest son, who survived the hail of bullets, was that witness.

Is the Justice Department suing San Francisco to stop this sort of irresponsible action? No, of course not.

Instead, the Justice Department is using taxpayer dollars to sue the State of Arizona for enforcing Federal laws. Arizona is not creating any new laws, they are merely enforcing the Federal law under concurrent jurisdiction.

The sanctuary cities pose a greater danger to American cities because they give a sanctuary to all illegals. They shield criminal aliens from being detained and deported by the Federal Government, and sanctuary cities, in my opinion, operate in violation of the Federal Government law prohibiting such. But because of politics, the administration is suing Arizona for upholding the law and refuses to sue sanctuary cities for violating Federal law.

We hear the rhetoric that illegals do jobs Americans won't do. Now we have an actual situation where Arizona is getting sued for doing a job the American government won't do—protecting the security of the country and enforcing the law.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. HALVORSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)